

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claim 11 has been amended. Claims 1-12 are pending and under consideration.

Rejection of Claim 11 Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

The Office Action rejects claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claim 11 is amended to obviate this rejection.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 11 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 1,448,024 issued to Brizgis in view of U.S. Patent 6,402,109 issued to Dittmer.

Brizgis and Dittmer, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, “an adjusting bracket having a plurality of screw holes provided along a length direction thereof, to adjust a height of the supporting bracket according to a position in which one of the screw holes is engaged with a screw to couple the adjusting bracket to the supporting bracket,” as recited in claim 11.

In contrast, Brizgis discloses “a bent rod 14 forming the upper end of a strut whose lower end is formed by a hollow bar 15 into which the rod telescopically projects, being secured in selected positions by a set screw 16,” (col. 1, lines 32-46 and Figures 1-3). In Figures 1-3, the set screw is always in the same position with respect to hollow bar 15. Brizgis does not disclose, teach, or suggest “an adjusting bracket having a plurality of screw holes along a length direction thereof,...” Accordingly, Brizgis cannot “adjust a height of the supporting bracket according to a position in which one of the screw holes is engaged with a screw to couple the adjusting bracket to the supporting bracket,” as recited in claim 11.

Dittmer does not cure the deficiencies of Brizgis. Although Dittmer discloses a flat panel display mounted on a wall, the flat panel display is mounted to the wall in a very different manner using a sliding pivot mechanism 36 as shown in Figure 1 and generally described in col. 2, lines 49-65 of Dittmer. Dittmer does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, “an adjusting bracket having a plurality of screw holes along a length direction thereof,...” Accordingly, Dittmer cannot “adjust a height of the supporting bracket according to a position in which one of the screw holes is engaged with a screw to couple the adjusting bracket to the supporting bracket,” as recited in claim 11.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 11 patentably distinguishes over the cited references.

Although the Office Action did not reject claim 12, claim 12 depends from claim 11 and includes all of the features of claim 11. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 12 also patentably distinguishes over the cited references.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Summary

Claims 1-12 are pending and under consideration. It is respectfully submitted that none of the references taken alone or in combination disclose the present claimed invention.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

September 6, 2005

By:



Paul F. Daebeler
Registration No. 35,852

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501